

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrison et al. (US 6,591,292, hereafter "Morrison") in view of Cheney et al. (US 6,519,283, hereafter "Cheney").

Claims 1 and 2 are amended to recite "giving each OSD display data a peculiar ID". These amendments are believed to overcome the §112, second paragraph, rejection.

Morrison relates to a method and interface for incorporating program information into an electronic message, and for receiving such program information by an electronic message and/or implementing, based on the received program information, a corresponding program.

Cheney relates to an integrated digital video processing system capable of receiving and merging a compressed digital video signal and an uncompressed analog video signal into a picture-in-picture display for a television system, either with or without overlaying of on-screen display graphics.

Applicant submits that Morrison fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 2. Specifically, Morrison does not teach or suggest an OSD source for transmitting OSD display data by giving each OSD display data a peculiar ID in at least more than one OSD object unit and transmitting an OSD ID and display location information if there is an OSD object command from the OSD source remote controller. In the Office Action, the Examiner refers to transport system 25 of Figure 2 of Morrison as allegedly corresponding to the claimed OSD source, but

Applicant disagrees. As disclosed at the bottom of col. 7 of Morrison, the output from decoder 30 is processed by transport system 25, which is responsive to commands from remote control unit 125. Transport system 25 provides compressed data outputs for storage, further decoding, or communication to other devices. In claim 2 of the present application, the OSD source gives each OSD display data a peculiar ID. However, Morrison does not disclose such a feature.

Morrison discloses that individual packets that comprise particular program channels are identified by packet identifiers (PIDs) in col. 8, lines 49-51, but these packet identifiers do not correspond to the peculiar ID claimed in claim 2, i.e., a peculiar ID for each OSD display data.

Rather, Morrison's PIDs identify individual packets, which comprise particular program channels.

Furthermore, Morrison fails to disclose an OSD source for transmitting an OSD object ID and display location information, if there is an OSD object display command from the OSD source remote controller. As disclosed in col. 11 of the reference, packet data corresponding to a composite program guide generated by the controller 115, may be transported to the video decoder 85 for formatting into a video signal suitable for display on a monitor connected to the video decoder 85. Also disclosed is that data port 75 may be used to provide high speed data such as computer programs to a computer or to output data to an HDTV decoder to display images corresponding to a selective program or a program guide. See col. 11, lines 21-30. However, Morrison does not disclose transmitting an OSD object ID and display location information if there is an OSD object display command from the OSD source remote controller. Instead, Morrison discloses transmitting the data itself each time, rather than an ID and display location information. This type of transmission is like the prior art from which the present

Why not?  
# OSD, as any other  
packet data  
ID must have an

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U. S. Application No. 09/840,023

application is distinguished. See page 2, second paragraph of the present specification, for example.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 2 and its dependent claims 3-8 are allowable over the prior art.

Also, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art for reasons analogous to those presented above in relation to claim 2.


With further regard to claim 4, even if the Examiner's assertion that output asynchronous plug registers are well known in the art is correct, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify Morrison to include such a register. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to modify Morrison so that the data can be received and retrieved asynchronously, but using an output asynchronous plug register is not necessarily required to enable asynchronous data. Other means could be provided, but the Examiner has failed to explain why it would have been obvious to modify Morrison to include an output asynchronous plug register, in particular. Thus, claim 4 is allowable for this additional reason.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U. S. Application No. 09/840,023

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Cameron W. Beddard  
Registration No. 46,545

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 5, 2003